(98)

PROVISIONAL
For participants only

CERD/C/SR.948
13 August 1992

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Forty-first session

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 948th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 10 August 1992, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DIACONU

CONTENTS

Organization of work

Consideration of reports, comments and information submitted by States parties under article 9 of the Convention (continued)

Ninth and tenth periodic reports of Chile (continued)

Initial report of Viet Nam

Second, third and fourth periodic reports of Somalia (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

GE.92-17049/4775B (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Mrs. KLEIN-BIDMON (Centre for Human Rights) informed the Committee that the Chairman, Mr. Valencia Rodriguez, had unfortunately been taken ill and was in hospital. Mr. Diaconu would therefore take the Chair at the present meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (agenda item 7) (continued)

Ninth and tenth periodic reports of Chile (CERD/C/196/Add.1) (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Bengoa, Mr. Ivlic, Mr. Llanos and Mr. Oyarce (Chile) took places at the Committee table.

Mr. BENGOA (Chile) thanked members of the Committee for their positive comments both on the tenth report, which was combined with the ninth, and on the political situation in his country. As Mr. van Boven had pointed out, the people of Chile had cause to be grateful to international organizations for what they had done to help restore democracy. His delegation would transmit to the President the view expressed by a number of members - a view with which he fully concurred - that Chile should make the declaration provided for under article 14 of the Convention as soon as possible as a further stage in the democratization process.

As an illustration of how indigenous peoples in Chile suffered from discrimination, he quoted from a newspaper report stating that 63 applications for changes of name had been published in one issue of the Official Bulletin. The changes had been applied for on the ground that indigenous names were a barrier to obtaining employment. Discrimination was a complex phenomenon in Chile and was as yet not governed by legislation, although the Government was making efforts to combat it. It would be a sign that those efforts were succeeding if in a few years' time applications for changes of name had decreased.

Members of the Committee had asked whether other minorities in the country suffered from discrimination. There were practically no groups which were discriminated against on purely ethnic or racial grounds. Neither colonies of Europeans nor immigrant groups suffered from such treatment, nor did the small black population. There was a long-standing tradition in Chile of welcoming immigrants, who were regarded as enriching Chilean society and were accordingly rapidly assimilated.

Several speakers had expressed concern about the political situation in Chile. After 18 years of military government, democracy had been restored, not by revolution but by a peaceful and orderly process of negotiation. In reply to Mrs. Sadiq Ali, he said that the Constitution of 1980 had been amended following a plebiscite in 1989, and it was that amended Constitution that was now in force. The Commander-in-Chief of the Army, who could not be removed from his post, was still General Pinochet. Members of the Senate were elected, but many were still those appointed under the previous regime, and the same was true of members of the Supreme Court. A bill was now before Parliament which was to introduce far-reaching changes in the administration of justice. Among the important constitutional reforms adopted was one empowering the President to pardon political prisoners.

In reply to a question from Mr. Ferrero Costa, he said that the Mapuches were among the poorest sections of the population. A recent study had shown that, in terms of infant mortality, morbidity and illiteracy, they were below the national average. Because of the greater number of job opportunities in the cities, the rate of migration among Mapuches was high. The situation of the Aymara and Rapanui people was somewhat better, since although relatively poor, they possessed more resources.

On the question of the demographic composition of the population, it was difficult to obtain figures, and thus the report might contain some contradictions. Altogether, the indigenous population numbered approximately 1 million. In the population census taken on 2 April 1992, Chileans had for the first time been asked to state their ethnic origin. The results of that census would be available in a few months, and he would transmit them to the Committee.

Questions had been raised concerning the Yamanas, the Alacalufes, the Kawashkar and other minorities in the extreme south of the country. The four tribes that had previously inhabited that part of the country had been decimated following the invasion of colonizers from the mainland, and as a result only very small numbers of them remained. A year earlier, an organization had been set up in Punta Areñas for the benefit of some 50 young people of indigenous origin who had left their communities; two had been given scholarships to university and seven were following technical courses. It was hoped to build a centre in the region to develop a programme of activities for such people and to begin the process of re-identifying indigenous groups. The

draft Indigenous Peoples Act now before Parliament provided for the granting of special fishing rights, and rights over other resources, to indigenous peoples, and it was hoped that such measures would help to halt the process whereby they were gradually becoming extinct.

A number of questions had been raised concerning the territory of the Mapuches: it was true that many Mapuche organizations had opposed the parcelling out of communal land. Under the military regime, more than 60,000 land titles had been allocated with the result that 2,000 existing community holdings had been abolished. With the advent of democratic government in May 1990, those land allocations had been declared invalid, and consultations had been held with the various communities on how best to regulate the situation from the legal point of view. The bill currently under discussion provided for a combined system of individually owned and communally owned land. Generally speaking, land in the vicinity of dwellings and land used for horticulture would be private, whereas forests and pastures would be communal. It was proposed to set up an Indigenous Land and Water Fund, which would enable the communities to acquire further resources. In reply to Mr. van Boven, he said that the bill had been approved by the Chamber of Deputies, and he hoped it would become law in the course of the year. Its provisions ensured that Mapuche territory would be protected from potentially destructive commercial pressures, and it also provided for a speedy and effective land claims procedure, to be financed by the Government.

It was true that there had been serious problems in regard to land disputes, notably in Cantin, and other conflicts over the construction of hydroelectric and other projects, but there was hope that they would be resolved harmoniously, given the Government's firm political will to find solutions to such problems by peaceful means.

In reply to a further question from Mrs. Sadiq Ali, he said it was true that the northern part of the country was virtually a desert zone where water was a vital resource, and that indigenous communities had suffered from pressures by mining companies in that respect. In June 1992, an Act had been passed amending the Water Code to prohibit exploitation of water resources on which indigenous communities depended.

In Easter Island, the Act of 1966 restricting access to private property to inhabitants of the Island was still in force. The Easter Islanders had in fact entered a writ against the State on the matter in 1988, a writ which had

been suspended for two and a half years pending adoption of the new Indigenous Peoples Act now before Parliament. Recently, local elections had been held on the Island, and a new Chief of the Council of Elders had been elected. Discussions were now being held with the Council on the introduction of a new legal regime.

Participation of indigenous peoples in the country's poltical life would be regulated under the bill now before Parliament, which would also provide for judicial remedies in cases of discrimination. One significant measure under that bill would be the establishment of an Indigenous Development Corporation, half of whose members would be appointed by the Government, and half by indigenous groups. It was hoped that indigenous participation in public life at all levels would increase. He pointed out that, in keeping with the country's liberal traditions, there was no "quota" for elections to Parliament or for local elections: members were elected by universal suffrage, on their own merits, and not in the capacity of representatives of their particular indigenous group.

In reply to Mr. Ferrero Costa, he said that while relations with South Africa had been encouraged under the military regime, they had been played down under the new Government. Recently, however, a Chilean ambassador had been accredited to South Africa in recognition of that country's progress towards a united, multiracial and democratic regime. Chile had complied with all resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly in that regard. The Government's policy was to support all efforts to eliminate apartheid in South Africa.

Where discrimination against the rural and urban poor was concerned, it was true that severe poverty existed in many parts of the country, but it could not be said that the poor suffered from racial or ethnic discrimination in terms of article 1 of the Convention.

Mrs. Sadiq Ali had asked whether organized groups promoting racial discrimination existed in the country. Fortunately, he was not aware of any such groups. Frequent public discussions on the subject of discrimination were held on television and radio, and the Ministry of Education had launched a programme designed to increase public awareness of the issue.

Chile was emerging from a long period of human rights violations, and the Government was determined that such an era in its history should never be repeated. Its wish was to collaborate with the Committee, in the knowledge

that any form of discrimination anywhere in the world had its effects on all countries and on peoples everywhere. He assured members that Chile's next report would comply fully with the Committee's guidelines.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Chile for the full replies he had given to the Committee's questions.

Mr. van BOVEN said he, too, wished to thank the Chilean representative for his very extensive replies. He noted with satisfaction the latter's announcement that his Government would soon be making the declaration provided for under article 14 of the Convention.

Mr. Bengoa, Mr. Ivelic, Mr. Llanos and Mr. Oyarce (Chile) withdrew.

Initial report of Viet Nam (CERD/C/101/Add.5)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Nguyen Luong (Viet Nam) took a place at the Committee table.

Mr. NGUYEN LUONG (Viet Nam) said, in accordance with the instructions it had received, his delegation formally requested the Committee to defer consideration of the Vietnamese report until the next session, so as to enable the Government to produce an updated document in the light of current changes. He would welcome the Committee's advice and suggestions on the content of the forthcoming report.

Viet Nam, a multinational State, intended to pursue its policy of ensuring that all citizens had equal rights and duties; that included the ethnic nationalities, whose welfare and advancement were promoted in accordance with the Convention. Article 5 of the new Constitution of Viet Nam provided, inter alia, that the State of Viet Nam was the unitary State of all nationalities living together in its territory. It implemented a policy of equality, solidarity and mutual assistance among the nationalities, and all acts of discrimination and division between the nationalities were strictly prohibited. The ethnic nationalities had the right to use their own spoken and written language, to preserve their national identity and to practise and enjoy their own customs, traditions and cultures. The State pursued a policy of overall development in order to raise the standard of living and cultural level of the ethnic nationalities. Under a Council of Ministers' decision of February 1990, a special government office had been made responsible for the economic and social development of the ethnic nationalities and for political questions concerning them. It was in charge of the implementation of the

development plan for the highlands - the regions in which those communities lived - up to the year 2000. In articles 29, 35 and 36, the 1992 Constitution made special provision for education and human resources development in the regions inhabited by ethnic nationalities, while the Council of Ministers ensured that the relevant financial and budgetary measures were taken to guarantee the implementation of those provisions.

At the international level, the Government of Viet Nam undertook to continue to support the struggle of peoples against racial discrimination and segregation. He took the opportunity to submit to the Committee a statement made on 25 July 1992 by the spokeswoman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam on the recent massacre of two Vietnamese families in Cambodia. Public opinion considered the massacre to be inspired by racial hatred, and he hoped that the Committee would not let it go unnoticed.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the representative of Viet Nam had requested that consideration of its periodic report should be postponed until 1993, and that the delegation was now seeking the Committee's advice in preparing that report. He asked Committee members whether they wished to confine the discussion to comments and advice in response to that request.

Mr. de GOUTTES said that, as country rapporteur designated to make a preliminary study of the implementation of the Convention in Viet Nam, he welcomed the presence of the representative of Viet Nam and was willing to present the ad hoc report he had prepared on the basis of existing documents.

Mr. YUTZIS commended the Government of Viet Nam's clear desire for dialogue. Given that country's special circumstances, the Committee should agree to its specific request for rescheduling of the consideration of the periodic report and, in the meantime, provide it with advice in preparing that report.

Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that the particular circumstances of Viet Nam, as described by its representative, warranted postponement of consideration of its report. With regard to advice on how to proceed in preparing a report, he referred the representative of Viet Nam to the Committee's guidelines, which could be transmitted to the Government, together with previous reports of the Committee.

Mr. de GOUTTES suggested that, pending the rescheduled consideration of Viet Nam's report, to which the Committee clearly agreed, a preliminary exchange of views might be held on the basis of documents that were available to the Committee.

Mr. SONG Shuhua supported the proposal to postpone consideration of Viet Nam's report in view of recent and current developments in that country. He, too, drew attention to the Committee's guidelines and agreed to giving the delegation of Viet Nam some advice on the preparation of its report, but would not be in favour of a lengthy discussion, since a report would be forthcoming in 1993.

Mr. YUTZIS said that there appeared to be consensus on considering the periodic report in 1993. That being so, he drew the attention of the Vietnamese delegation to a fundamental principle, namely, that the very existence of the Committee largely depended on the seriousness with which States parties discharged the responsibilities to which they had subscribed on acceding to the Convention, including their reporting obligations. Viet Nam's periodic report was long overdue, and he trusted that it would now be submitted, as promised, in 1993.

The advisory services available within the Centre for Human Rights might be useful in helping the Government of Viet Nam with some of the procedural aspects of preparing its report.

Referring to the written statement submitted by the representative of Viet Nam concerning an incident which had occurred in Cambodia and involving a complaint against that country, he drew attention to article 11 of the Convention and to the possibility of submitting such a complaint under that article. If the Committee agreed, the representative of Viet Nam might convey that possibility to his Government, should the denunciation fall within the scope of that article.

Mr. van BOVEN commended the Government of Viet Nam on its willingness to engage in a dialogue and looked forward to receiving its written report as soon as possible. He suggested that the Committee might usefully hear the observations prepared by the country rapporteur, to which the representative of Viet Nam could respond as he saw fit, but refrain from drawing any conclusions and making final recommendations until it was able to consider the substantive, updated report.

Mr. SHAHI endorsed the comments made by Mr. Yutzis and agreed that consideration of the periodic report should be postponed. He supported the suggestion that the representative of Viet Nam might avail himself of the opportunity to seek guidance on reporting procedures from the Centre for Human Rights.

Mr. RECHETOV said that the procedure suggested by Mr. van Boven did not appear to allow for a full exchange of views within the Committee. He pointed out that there was nothing in the Convention to say that a report had to be submitted in writing, and there had been many cases in the past when the Committee had proceeded with a discussion of the situation in a given country even when the written report contained no factual information.

The CHAIRMAN said he took the prevailing view to be that, in the case now before the Committee, the Committee should not enter into a substantive debate in the absence of a written report, but that the comments prepared by the country rapporteur, adjusted to suit the changed circumstances, might provide useful background information.

Mr. de GOUTTES said that he had prepared a number of comments that might contribute to a preliminary exchange of views. First of all, the Committee should welcome the Government of Viet Nam's obvious willingness to renew its dialogue with the Committee by sending a delegation to explain its position. Even though no written report had been submitted, it was a laudable gesture at a time when the country was passing through a period of difficult transition and reconstruction.

Since becoming a party to the Convention in 1982, Viet Nam had submitted only one report to the Committee. He had consequently examined the situation of Viet Nam on the basis of other available information, both general information from non-governmental organizations and more specific information from other United Nations sources, in particular, Viet Nam's initial report to the Human Rights Committee on its implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, dated 7 July 1989.

On the basis of that information, the Committee should consider the reasons for Viet Nam's delay in submitting reports, recall its own assessment of the situation in Viet Nam when it had considered Viet Nam's previous report in 1983, and specify what it now expected of that country. With regard to its failure to submit reports, there were extenuating circumstances - successive wars, a precarious economic situation and internal problems, especially the

imperatives of reconstruction and renewal. The fact that Viet Nam had taken an initial step by submitting a report to the Human Rights Committee was encouraging. The Committee was sensitive to the difficulties of countries which did not have the administrative resources and facilities to fulfil their reporting obligations. He suggested that the Committee should offer technical assistance to the Government of Viet Nam for that purpose, with the help of the advisory services of the Centre for Human Rights.

Recapitulating the Committee's assessment of Viet Nam's initial report, he said that the initial report had failed to follow the guidelines and had been too general and too brief. Insufficient information had been given on the ethnic and demographic composition of the country. The Committee had raised the question of the exodus of refugees, noting that there must have been some compelling reason to force so many people from their homes. The Committee had also requested details of the latest constitutional provisions, noting some discrepancy between the 1946, 1959 and 1980 Constitutions.

With regard to the effective implementation of articles 2 to 7 of the Convention, the Committee had found the information provided to be inadequate, and had asked a series of questions and requested a number of explanations regarding, for instance, the Council of Nationalities responsible for ethnic affairs.

Viet Nam's report to the Human Rights Committee in 1989 and that Committee's conclusions on the subject contained more recent information of interest to the Committee, for instance, on ethnic minorities in Viet Nam and on the preparation of a new Constitution, as well as the information that the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination could be incorporated into Viet Nam's legislation.

What, therefore, should now be expected of the Vietnamese Government? In general, it should be requested to furnish, as soon as possible, a comprehensive and updated second periodic report, submitted in accordance with the new guidelines on the format and content of reports adopted by the Committee in 1991. The report should consist of two parts, the first dealing with the framework in which the Convention was being implemented, namely the country's current social, economic, political and institutional situation, and the second with the actual implementation of each article of the Convention.

Certain issues would be of particular concern to the Committee, including socio-economic and demographic indicators and details concerning the major changes now under way.

It was often claimed that Viet Nam was fully committed to economic revival, transition to a market economy and the principle of opening up the country to the international community, but it appeared that the Communist authorities were concerned to maintain the predominance of the State apparatus and the Party. Admittedly, available information indicated that the new Constitution adopted on 15 April 1992 represented a significant step forward towards a State based on the rule of law, guaranteeing freedom of speech, association, the press and religious belief, without asserting the primacy of socialism. It also contained new provisions on the law of property and inheritance and free enterprise. In 1990, however, the Human Rights Committee had concluded that the Government stressed too systematically the sovereign rights of the State over the individual and that, while the war had undoubtedly been responsible for many of the difficulties experienced by Viet Nam in implementing the provisions of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it should not be used to justify the restriction of certain rights and freedoms. The Government should provide explanations in that connection and details regarding the new Constitution, the implications of the general elections and the process of democratization.

The next report should indicate how the Convention had been incorporated in domestic legislation, whether it took precedence over domestic law and whether it could be invoked before the courts.

Turning to the specific articles of the Convention, and article 2 in particular, he said that the Vietnamese Government should respond to the concern expressed by the Human Rights Committee in 1990 regarding discrimination between north and south Vietnamese and any tensions or resentments to which it might have given rise. It should also indicate what steps had been taken to combat the traditional prejudices against minority ethnic groups regarded as having collaborated with France and the United States in opposing the Vietnamese liberation forces. It seemed that certain groups were particularly disadvantaged in material terms, especially as far as access to education was concerned.

Another source of concern was the fate of children of mixed background in Viet Nam. Such children were often regarded as pariahs, being abandoned by their irresponsible fathers and by their mothers, who were hesitant to acknowledge them. What steps was the Government taking on their behalf, particularly in the light of its ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child?

In the case of articles 4 and 6, he hoped that the next report would provide the texts of legislation penalizing racial or ethnic discrimination, and details of the outcome of cases arising from such laws.

In connection with article 5, he said that the Committee wished to receive information on people still interned in rehabilitation camps. Although many were known to have been released, some former soldiers and officials of the Saigon regime were evidently still being detained. What was being done to improve conditions in those camps and, more important, what steps were being taken to eliminate them? Questions also arose in connection with restrictions on movement and on the right to leave the country, and with the system of residence permits, which might constitute an infringement of the right to privacy.

The Committee also wished to be informed of the current status of refugees, and especially the "boat people". The representative of Viet Nam had stated in the Human Rights Committee in 1990 that voluntary repatriation from countries of first asylum would be in conditions of safety and dignity and without repressive or discriminatory measures. However, according to available information, the Vietnamese Government, in order to intensify its efforts to curtail "illegal departures", had concluded an agreement in October 1991 with the United Kingdom providing for forced repatriation of refugees in Hong Kong. In addition, the Committee wished to be informed of the fate of the many Vietnamese workers sent to the former Soviet Union and certain East European countries, where they had often lived in very difficult circumstances.

Noting that the new Constitution made no mention of the right not to be subjected to discrimination for reasons of political opinion, he inquired what compensation was available to victims of such discrimination. In the context of the right to freedom of religion, reports had been received of surveillance and harassment of religious leaders, both Buddhist and Catholic, and the Committee would wish to know whether officials responsible for such

persecution had been punished. There also seemed to be instances of discrimination in the system of registration, in that failure to register or exclusion could involve forfeiture of the right to housing, employment, health-care and the education of children.

With regard to the implementation of article 7 of the Convention, the Committee wished to know whether measures had been taken in Viet Nam to publish and promote awareness of the Convention, and more generally to disseminate information on combating racial prejudice and defending human rights. Were the Vietnamese authorities encouraging the activities of non-governmental organizations for the defence of human rights, and were they continuing their cooperation with Amnesty International and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)?

In conclusion, he welcomed the fact that a Vietnamese representative had been able to be present to resume the dialogue with the Committee. The questions raised showed the keen interest the Committee took in the process of democratization in Viet Nam.

Mr. NGUYEN LUONG (Viet Nam) thanked the Committee for the ideas put forward during the discussion, which would be duly conveyed to his Government and taken into account in his country's next report.

On the question of refugees, he wished to mention that he was involved in the repatriation process, and that a comprehensive action programme for refugees had been worked out in collaboration with ICRC. A representative of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was actively monitoring the repatriation in order to ensure that it was carried out in an orderly fashion and with due respect for human dignity. The problem was purely humanitarian in nature and should not be politicized. In regard to ethnic groups, he said that both the Government and the new Constitution stressed the need to promote the human resources of those groups through education and development.

Mr. Nguyen Luong (Viet Nam) withdrew.

The CHAIRMAN said the Committee seemed to be in agreement that consideration of the report of Viet Nam should be postponed until 1993, and that it should draw the Vietnamese Government's attention to the availability of the advisory services of the Centre for Human Rights. The Permanent Mission of Viet Nam would contact the Centre in order to ascertain what kind of assistance might be required.

Second, third and fourth periodic reports of Somalia (CERD/C/88/Add.6)

Mr. ABOUL-NASR, country rapporteur, said he understood a letter had been received from the Permanent Mission of Somalia requesting that, in view of the country's current situation, consideration of its overdue report should be postponed until the Committee's next session. The letter had stated that the Somali Government would submit the report to the Committee as soon as the situation normalized.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had decided not to accede to the request of Somalia, in view of the fact that it had not given any definite date for submission of the report.

Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that he had not been present at the meeting in question. In the past, however, the Committee had always granted requests for postponement. The reasons for the Somali request were sound, given the chaos that currently prevailed in the country. It was not clear to him what exactly the Committee could discuss and what recommendations it could make, since there was no government in control to which they could be addressed. Furthermore, the situation in the country was not directly relevant to the Committee's work. The people of Somalia constituted a homogeneous group, spoke the same language and were of the same religion. The war being waged in the country was not the result of tribal differences, but was a conflict between two members of the same family.

Mr. LAMPTEY said he was in favour of accepting the request for postponement. In the unsettled conditions, it was not possible for Somalia to submit a periodic report or to give a date for the submission of such a report. The Committee needed only to express its regret at the situation.

Mr. SHAHI agreed that it was impossible for Somalia to provide a date for the submission of its report, but regretted that the request for postponement had not been made to the Committee by a representative of the country in person.

Mr. GARVALOV said that the Committee needed to adopt a position of principle and discuss what recommendations it wished to include in its report.

Mr. WOLFRUM said that human rights were being violated in Somalia and the Committee therefore had a duty to discuss the situation and make recommendations. He suggested that the Committee should express its regret at events in Somalia and urge the Security Council to take further action.

Mr. BANTON agreed that even if firm conclusions could not be reached, the topic needed to be discussed, so that the Committee could establish whether any recommendations could be made. In view of the provisions of article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which referred to discrimination based on descent, the conflict in Somalia was not completely irrelevant to the Committee's work.

Mr. de GOUTTES pointed out that it was not the first time that the Committee had had to deal with such a situation; there were precedents, for instance, Haiti. The discussion that had just taken place needed to be reflected in the Committee's report, which should state that the Committee was alarmed at the massacre of the civilian population in Somalia and condemned such inter-clan, inter-tribe conflicts. The ethnic element that he believed was involved in the conflict meant that Somalia was a relevant topic of discussion for the Committee.

Mr. FERRERO COSTA agreed that the Committee should consent to postpone consideration of Somalia's periodic report and should express its concern at the situation in the country, on which it needed to express an opinion, since there was an ethnic, even a tribal aspect to the conflict.

Mr. ABOUL-NASR suggested that the Committee's report should state that the Permanent Mission of Somalia had requested postponement of consideration of the country's report, that the Committee had accepted the request in view of the situation in Somalia, and that the Committee was concerned about the events taking place there.

Mr. LAMPTEY said that, under the Convention, the Committee was concerned with the fulfilment of the responsibilities of States. It was not its task to find a solution to conflicts between groups, ethnic or otherwise. Since there was no firm State authority in Somalia, he wondered who would be in a position to submit a report to the Committee. He accepted Mr. Aboul-Nasr's suggestion regarding the Committee's report.

Mr. SHAHI suggested that a small group of members should draw up recommendations and observations for consideration by the Committee at a later stage.

Mr. WOLFRUM supported that suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that Mr. Aboul-Nasr, Mr. Banton, Mr. Wolfrum and Mr. Ferrero Costa should cooperate in drafting a text.

He assumed that the request made by Somalia for consideration of its report to be postponed until the next session was accepted.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.